

April 6, 2011

TO: Teresa Parsons, SPHR
Director's Review Program Supervisor

FROM: Kris Brophy, SPHR
Director's Review Program Investigator

SUBJECT: Carol Mosebar v. Yakima Valley College
Allocation Review Request ALLO-10-049

Director's Determination

This position review was based on the work performed for the six-month period prior to May 4, 2010, the date Yakima Valley College Human Resources (YVC - HR) received the request for a position review. As the Director's Review Investigator, I carefully considered all of the documentation in the file, the exhibits, and the verbal comments provided by both parties during the review telephone conference. Based on my review and analysis of Ms. Mosebar's assigned duties and responsibilities, I conclude her position is properly allocated to the Office Assistant 2 classification.

Background

On May 4, 2010, YVC - HR received Ms. Mosebar's Position Review Request (PRR), asking that her position be reallocated to the Program Assistant classification. Ms. Mosebar signed the form on May 3, 2010. Ms. Mosebar's supervisor, Mr. Angel Reyna, did not sign the form but later submitted a statement (Exhibit B-2) which was used by YVC - HR in its review.

By letter dated August 26, 2010, YVC-HR informed Ms. Mosebar that her position was properly allocated as an Office Assistant 2 (Exhibit B-1).

On September 21, 2010, the Department of Personnel received Ms. Mosebar's request for a Director's review of YVC's allocation determination. In the letter, Ms. Mosebar requested that her position be reallocated to Program Assistant (Exhibit A-1).

On February 23, 2011, I conducted a Director's review telephone conference. Present during the call were Carol Mosebar; Dave Shiel, Staff Representative, WPEA; Cathy Van Winsen, Chief Union Steward, YVC; and Mark Rogstad, Director of Human Resources, Yakima Valley College.

Rationale for Director's Determination

The purpose of a position review is to determine which classification best describes the overall duties and responsibilities of a position. A position review is neither a measurement

of the volume of work performed, nor an evaluation of the expertise with which that work is performed. A position review is a comparison of the duties and responsibilities of a particular position to the available classification specifications. This review results in a determination of the class that best describes the overall duties and responsibilities of the position. Liddle-Stamper v. Washington State University, PAB Case No. 3722-A2 (1994).

Duties and Responsibilities

Ms. Mosebar works in the Workforce Education Office of the Basic Skills Division of Yakima Valley College. She provides clerical support to the Career Connection Center WorkFirst staff by monitoring, tracking and reporting client attendance into the State's tracking system (i.e. E-Jas) for all WorkFirst parents enrolled in the College's vocational, technical, short term and customized training classes and programs. Ms. Mosebar is responsible for monitoring WorkFirst parents (i.e. students) who are referred from DSHS, to make sure they meet state-required participation requirements for attending education activities at the College.

Ms. Mosebar is responsible for the daily tracking and reporting of all YVCC WorkFirst parent attendance. She answers phones, contacts WorkFirst parents about attendance, greets walk-ins and provides information about attendance requirements, processes and procedures. She assists students with completing required timekeeping and attendance forms. She enters student attendance in E-Jas, and performs other daily clerical support tasks.

Ms. Mosebar's supervisor, Mr. Angel Reyna, is the Director of Workforce Education. Mr. Reyna completed a supervisor's statement (Exhibit B-2), and disagreed with Ms. Mosebar's description of duties. He does not agree that the position fits the Program Assistant class. Mr. Reyna states the majority of her duties entails receptionist and data entry duties and is appropriately classified as an Office Assistant 2. His comments are reflected in italics in the sections below.

Ms. Mosebar's duties and responsibilities are summarized from the PRR (Exhibit A-2) as follows:

40% I am one of the first/main contacts for WorkFirst parents and for DSHS. This requires reviewing WorkFirst program requirements with the parent. I am a contact person for DSHS when they have a question in regards to the WorkFirst programs and availability.

Mr. Reyna states Ms. Mosebar serves as the main point of contact for parents for routine matters such as providing information related to completing and processing timesheets, and providing information related to dates and times for classes, etc. Mr. Reyna states Ms. Mosebar's contact with case managers at DSHS involves accepting or rejecting case manager referrals. Mr. Reyna states he is the contact person for DSHS for questions regarding the WorkFirst's programs and availability.

25% Compose correspondence and reports for case managers at DSHS.

Mr. Reyna states that Ms. Mosebar does not compose reports for case managers but rather makes notes in the E-Jas system indicating whether or not the parent

made contact, was absent, or what the parent said regarding being absent from a class.

20% Make phone calls to WorkFirst parents when they are not participating as required. I remind them of their requirements to meet WorkFirst participation. I also contact their case manager at DSHS to inform of their need to participate.

Mr. Reyna states Ms. Mosebar makes routine calls to parents to remind them to show up to education activities.

5% Use a spreadsheet/database software to track hours of WorkFirst parents.

Mr. Reyna states he is unaware of an Excel spreadsheet being used by Ms. Mosebar and that the 5% figure of time is too low. He states that about 50% of her job involves performing data entry functions.

Summary of Ms. Mosebar's Perspective

Ms. Mosebar asserts her position has grown over the last two and one-half years and has become more than data entry. She asserts the majority of her job is done without supervision, and involves working with a specialized program with specific rules and regulations. She contends her position meets the requirements of the Program Assistant class and should be allocated at that level.

Summary of Yakima Valley College's Reasoning

YVC asserts Ms. Mosebar's work does not require the interpretation of policies and/or activities related to a program specialty. YVC contends Ms. Mosebar's job involves performing routine clerical assignments in support of the Workforce Education Office, and therefore falls within the scope of her job classification as an Office Assistant 2.

Comparison of Duties

When comparing the assignment of work and level of responsibility to the available class specifications, the Class Series Concept (if one exists) followed by the Definition and Distinguishing Characteristics are primary considerations. While the Typical Work examples listed in a class specification do not form the basis for an allocation, they lend support to describing the work performed by that classification.

Comparison of Duties to the Program Assistant class.

The Class Series Concept for this class states:

Perform work requiring knowledge and experience that is specific to a program. Organize and perform work related to program operations independent of the daily administrative office needs of the supervisor. Represent the program to clients, participants and/or members of the public.

A program is a specialized area with specific complex components and discrete tasks which distinguish it from the main body of an organization. A program is specific to a particular subject. The specialized tasks involve interpretation of policies, procedures and regulations, budget coordination/administration, independent functioning and typically, public contact. Duties are not of a general support nature transferable from one program to another. Performance of clerical duties is in support of incumbent's performance of specialized tasks.

The Definition for this class states:

Perform specialized technical/clerical duties in support of a program activity.

The Distinguishing Characteristics state:

Under general supervision, perform work requiring knowledge and experience specific to the program. Provide students, staff, program participants and/or the public with information and interpretation of policies and activities related to the program specialty. Compose written communications, and establish and maintain records relating to program operations.

While not allocating criteria, the Typical Work statements further describe the nature and scope of duties performed as a Program Assistant such as the following:

Serve as primary contact with program participants; provide information regarding program policies and activities; perform a variety of public relations functions; ...

Ms. Mosebar's duties do not fully reach the requirements of this class. The primary focus of her position is to perform clerical tasks in support of the Workforce Education Office.

Ms. Mosebar does not represent the program to clients, participants and the public at the level anticipated by this class. Mr. Reyna states that Ms. Mosebar serves as the point of contact for parents for routine clerical matters such as providing information related to completing and processing timesheets, and providing information related to dates and times for classes, etc. Mr. Reyna states that he is the primary point of contact with DSHS case managers and acts as the representative regarding WorkFirst programs and availability. Mr. Reyna acknowledges Ms. Mosebar contacts case managers at DSHS regarding accepting or rejecting initial case manager (i.e. "RA") referrals. However, he emphasizes the acceptance or rejection of the initial referral is a routine process.

In addition, Ms. Mosebar reviews WorkFirst parents' Individual Responsibility Plans (IRPs) developed by DSHS case managers to make sure they are correct and meet the program's prescribed participation requirements. However, Ms. Mosebar does not have responsibility for working with participants in determining initial participant eligibility, placement, or performing other WorkFirst program functions. These responsibilities rest with her co-workers (Coordinator's) and/or her supervisor. Ms. Mosebar acknowledged during the telephone review conference that she does not interact or provide direct programmatic support to the Coordinator or her supervisor regarding other program functions or activities other than tracking attendance for students participating within the Coordinator's assigned business areas.

While Ms. Mosebar provides information and performs work requiring knowledge and experience specific to participation and attendance requirements, the nature of her contact with clients involves following prescribed requirements established by DSHS to provide information such as completing and processing attendance timesheets, and providing information related to dates and times for classes. The focus of her position does not require interpretation of policies and/or activities related to the program specialty as a whole. In addition, she is not required to compose written communications for the program, and although she inputs attendance information into the E-Jas system, she is not required to establish and maintain records relating to program operations as a whole.

Ms. Mosebar's position serves as the primary point of contact for WorkFirst parents entering the program to explain attendance and participation processes and procedures. The focus of her position is to provide information and discuss participation and attendance requirements with student parents upon initial intake, monitor daily attendance, address attendance issues, and enter attendance information into the E-Jas system. The duties assigned to her position are more consistent with the Office Assistant series where incumbents perform clerical duties in support of unit operations. In total, her duties do not fully reach the requirements of the Program Assistant class. For these reasons her position should not be reallocated to the Program Assistant class.

Comparison of Duties to the Office Assistant series

The Class Series Concept for the Office Assistant series states that positions perform "a variety of clerical duties in support of office or unit operations."

Ms. Mosebar's position fits within this series by performing a variety of clerical duties in support of the Workforce Education Office.

Comparison of Duties to Office Assistant 3

The Definition for Office Assistant 3 states:

Under general supervision, independently perform a variety of complex clerical projects and assignments such as preparing reports, preparing, reviewing, verifying and processing fiscal documents and/or financial records, composing correspondence such as transmittals and responses to frequent requests for information, establishing manual or electronic recordkeeping/filing systems and/or data base files, and responding to inquiries requiring substantive knowledge of office/departmental policies and procedures. Positions may perform specialized complex word processing tasks in a word processing unit or complex rapid data inquiry and/or entry functions.

The Distinguishing Characteristics for Office Assistant 3 include the following:

Assignments and projects are of a complex nature. Independent performance of complex clerical assignments requires substantive knowledge of a variety of regulations, rules, policies, procedures, processes, materials, or equipment. Problems are resolved by choosing from established procedures and/or devising work methods. Guidance is available for new or unusual situations.

Deviation from established parameters requires approval. Work is periodically reviewed to verify compliance with established policies and procedures. . . .

Ms. Mosebar's position does not reach the overall scope and level of responsibility of the Definition and Distinguishing Characteristics of this class.

Incumbents in this class independently perform a variety of complex clerical projects and assignments, including assignments requiring substantive knowledge of a variety of regulations, rules, policies, processes and procedures.

In terms of her more complex duties, Ms. Mosebar reviews initial "RA" referrals and Individual Responsibility Plans (IRP's) developed by DSHS case managers to ensure WorkFirst parents meet prescribed participation criteria. If either the initial "RA" referral or IRP does not meet the established requirements they are returned to the DSHS case manager for further development. While Mr. Reyna acknowledges Ms. Mosebar contacts case managers at DSHS regarding referrals and IRPs, he describes participation as a straightforward process involving attending a prescribed number of hours per week or meeting a goal of so many hours per month. Mr. Reyna states this process does not require analytical analysis as Ms. Mosebar describes. This is consistent with Ms. Mosebar's statement in the PRR that parents are required to meet participation rates of 139 hours per month and have options of participating in core and non-core activities.

Ms. Mosebar states in the PRR that she has responsibility for monitoring activity participation rates and attendance of WorkFirst parents who are referred from DSHS, to make sure they meet required state guidelines. When a parent is referred to YVCC they are required to contact her. Mr. Reyna states that her contact involves providing routine information, explaining how to fill out a time sheet, where the classes are located, and how many hours they need to attend. She also takes phone calls that require the same routine information or notes absences in their attendance records when students call in sick.

Ms. Mosebar states that she explains attendance requirements to parents. When they are absent they are required to call and let her know and she records the information into the E-Jas reporting software. She provides parents with attendance sheets to fill in their hours and obtain instructors' signatures each week, verifying their attendance. Parents are required to turn in the attendance sheet every Friday with signatures so those hours can be recorded. Mr. Reyna states Ms. Mosebar follows set guidelines and shares routine information regarding these processes.

Ms. Mosebar tracks attendance and contacts parents when they have not turned in their attendance information. If a parent is not fulfilling their attendance requirements, she sends an immediate notification to the parent's case manager asking them to refer the student back to DSHS. Once she receives approval from the case manager, the student is referred back to DSHS for further action.

Ms. Mosebar states she then does case staffing with DSHS personnel via phone or e-mail. She discusses with the DSHS case manager what the next options are for the parent, and whether the parent will continue or be removed from the program. Ms. Mosebar asserted during the review conference that this is a complex process and that she has several different situations to cover and that she discusses with DSHS staff what the best options are for the parent and/or the program. Mr. Reyna states in his written comments that case staffing is his responsibility and he is involved in case staffing with DSHS. He states that

Ms. Mosebar is confusing case staffing with the CAP (Continuous Activity Plan) process where she discusses with the co-located DSHS staff whether the student should continue or not based on what DSHS recommends. Mr. Reyna states that Ms. Mosebar's level of participation with the CAP process is routine, and that he gets involved if there are complicated aspects to the situation.

Therefore, the majority of Ms. Mosebar's work, and the overall scope and level of responsibility of her position as a whole does not reach the requirements of the Office Assistant 3 class. Her position principally involves performing routine data entry and reviewing and sharing routine information based on set criteria and established guidelines.

Her position does not require substantive knowledge of policies or overall program requirements. Her responsibility for reviewing IRPs requires following established criteria set by DSHS. In addition, the nature of her contacts with student parents principally involves informing rather than explaining information. She explains how to fill out attendance forms. When students are not meeting attendance requirements she provides routine calls to remind them of their absences.

She calls case workers and provides routine information regarding students who are not meeting attendance requirements. She answers questions by looking up information or extracting data from source documents. She makes notations in case records that document approval or rejection and documents the student's reason for being absent.

Her overall decision-making authority is limited. She passes along attendance information to DSHS case managers who are responsible for deciding whether a parent remains in the program. Her supervisor states that he handles complex situations and deals with case workers.

In total, Ms. Mosebar's position should not be reallocated to the Office Assistant 3 class.

Comparison of Duties to Office Assistant 2

The Definition for Office Assistant 2 states:

Performs a variety of routine clerical duties such as processing documents and records, extracting and compiling records or data, responding to routine inquiries concerning office/departmental services and procedures, maintaining and monitoring established record keeping, filing and data base systems, and producing forms, letters, record entries and other material. Positions may perform data retrieval and modification and enter data on numerical or alphabetical data entry equipment.

The Distinguishing Characteristics for this class state:

Duties and assignments are of a routine nature. Routine duties are recurring and accomplished by following established work methods or procedures. Within established guidelines, independently organizes, prioritizes, and initiates work activities. Decision making authority is limited to choice of appropriate methods or procedures. Guidance is provided in new or unusual situations. Deviation from

established methods, procedures, or guidelines requires approval. Work is periodically reviewed to verify compliance with policies, procedures, or standards.

Positions may occasionally help and/or provide work direction to lower level staff.

The overall scope and level of responsibility of Ms. Mosebar's position meets the Definition of this class for performing a majority of routine clerical duties. This includes processing attendance documents and records, compiling and entering data into the E-Jas database, responding to routine inquiries concerning office/departmental services and procedures related to class attendance and participation, performing data entry and maintaining and monitoring the E-Jas data base system relative to student attendance.

As stated in the Distinguishing Characteristics, the majority of her duties are of a routine and recurring nature, primarily involving tracking, monitoring and entering attendance information into the E-Jas system.

Ms. Mosebar's position serves as the primary point of contact for WorkFirst parents entering the program to explain attendance and participation processes and procedures. The focus of her position is to provide information and discuss participation and attendance requirements with student parents upon initial intake, monitor daily attendance, address attendance issues, and enter attendance information into the E-Jas system. The nature of Ms. Mosebar's contact with clients involves following prescribed requirements established by DSHS to provide information such as completing and processing attendance timesheets, and providing information related to dates and times for classes. A significant portion of her work involves entering attendance information into the E-Jas system.

The duties assigned to her position are more consistent with the Office Assistant 2 class where incumbents perform routine clerical duties in support of unit operations. Her duties do not fully reach the requirements of the Office Assistant 3 class. For these reasons her position should remain allocated to the Office Assistant 2 class.

While a small portion of Ms. Mosebar's duties may be similar in nature to aspects of work identified in the Program Assistant class, she may occasionally perform duties outside of her classification. The Personnel Resources Board (PRB) addressed such an issue in the following decision:

Most positions within the civil service system occasionally perform duties that appear in more than one classification. However, when determining the appropriate classification for a specific position, the duties and responsibilities of that position must be considered in their entirety and the position must be allocated to the classification that provides the best fit overall for the majority of the position's duties and responsibilities. See Dudley v. Dept. of Labor and Industries, PRB Case No. R-ALLO-07-007 (2007).

It is clear the work she performs is very important and valued. A position's allocation is not a reflection of performance or an individual's ability to perform higher-level work. Rather, it is based on a comparison of duties and responsibilities to the available job classifications. The Office Assistant 2 classification best encompasses the overall scope of work and level of responsibility assigned to her position.

Appeal Rights

RCW 41.06.170 governs the right to appeal. RCW 41.06.170(4) provides, in relevant part, the following:

An employee incumbent in a position at the time of its allocation or reallocation, or the agency utilizing the position, may appeal the allocation or reallocation to . . . the Washington personnel resources board Notice of such appeal must be filed in writing within thirty days of the action from which appeal is taken.

The mailing address for the Personnel Resources Board (PRB) is P.O. Box 40911, Olympia, Washington, 98504-0911. The PRB Office is located at 600 South Franklin, Olympia, Washington. The main telephone number is (360) 664-0388, and the fax number is (360) 753-0139.

If no further action is taken, the Director's determination becomes final.

c: Carol Mosebar, YVC
Dave Shiel, WPEA
Mark L. Rogstad, SPHR, YVC
Lisa Skriletz, DOP

Enclosure: List of Exhibits

Carol Mosebar v. Yakima Valley Community College
Allo-10-049

List of Exhibits

A. Carol Mosebar Exhibits

1. Request for Director's Review form for Carol Mosebar, received by DOP on September 21, 2010.
2. Position Review Request form for Carol Mosebar, received by YVC-HR on May 4, 2010. (Note: Does not contain supervisor signature)
3. Performance and Development Plan Evaluation for Carol Mosebar dated September 1, 2009.
4. Performance and Development Plan Expectations for Carol Mosebar dated September 1, 2009.
5. Original WorkFirst Office Assistant 2 (eJAS) job description.

B. Yakima Valley Community College Exhibits

1. A cover letter from Mark L. Rogstad to Carol Mosebar dated August 26, 2010, including a copy of the Position Audit Findings dated August 12, 2010 (4 pages).
2. Supervisor Response to Position Review Request form for Carol Mosebar by Angel Reyna.
3. Cover letter from Mark Rogstad dated October 14, 2010 with a list and description of documents considered during allocation review process.
4. Organizational Chart for the Basic Skills Division (2010-2011).
5. Photo copy of the office contact card for Carol Mosebar and a copy of the office map for the department.
6. Screen shot of the daily referrals check list from the e-JAS software.
7. Photocopy of 2 pages from the "WorkFirst Handbook".
8. Photocopy of the "WorkFirst Participation and Reporting Sheet".
9. Copy of the "Yakima CSO" Job Training and Life Skills Classes schedule for fall quarter (2010).

C. Class Specifications

1. DOP Class Specification for Program Assistant (107 M).
2. DOP Class Specification for Office Assistant 2 (100I).
3. DOP Class Specification for Office Assistant 2 (100J).